

8



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,525	04/20/2001	Dietrich Charisius	30013630-0011	2161

23485 7590 07/13/2004

JINAN GLASGOW

P O BOX 28539

RALEIGH, NC 276118539

EXAMINER

SHRADER, LAWRENCE J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2124

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,525

Applicant(s)

CHARISIUS ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence Shrader

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/20/2001; 7/16/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-268 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-268 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/16/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/16/2001 is acknowledged and has been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show Figures 19A and 19B as well as reference numbers 1902 through 1912 as described in the specification on pages 29 and 30. Only Figure 19 with reference number 1900 is found in the drawings. Also, the drawings are inconsistent with several instances of drawing numbers and reference numbers as put forth in the "Brief Description of the Drawings" section on pages 5 – 7 of the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP§608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be

Art Unit: 2124

labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. It is requested that the applicant updates the status of the copending applications indicated on pages 1 and 2 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8; 10 – 13, 15 – 18; 20 – 22, 24 – 27; 29 – 166; 167 – 169, 171 – 174; 176 – 178, 180 – 183; 185 – 187, 189 – 192; 194 – 196, 198 – 201; 203 – 206, 208 – 211; 213 – 215, 217 – 220; 222 – 224, 226 – 229; 231 – 233, 235 – 238; 240 – 242, 244 – 247; 249 – 252, 254 – 257; 259 – 261, 263 – 266, and 268 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pazel, U.S. Patent 5,410,648 (Reissue 36,422).

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 1:

"displaying a graphical representation of the source code;

receiving a message corresponding to a portion of the source code;

locating the portion of the source code corresponding to the message;

displaying the portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner;

determining whether the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is displayed; and

when it is determined that the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is not displayed, displaying the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message; and

modifying the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner."

Pazel discloses a graphical representation of source code (e.g., Figure 7), receiving a message corresponding to a portion of the code (a breakpoint constitutes a message corresponding to a portion of the code), and locating the portion of the code corresponding to the breakpoint (message), determines a graphical representation and displays the graphical representation (e.g., Figure 9), allowing the user to modify the graphical representation of the code in a visually distinctive manner with highlighting (column 2, lines 23 – 26).

In regard to claim 2, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...wherein the message is received from a verification tool."

The debugger is the verification tool (column 4, lines 5 – 12).

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 3, incorporating the rejection of claim 2:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a compiler."

The debugger is used in conjunction with a compiler (column 3, lines 60 – 65).

In regard to claim 5, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...wherein the message comprises an error message."

It is well known in the art that a breakpoint is inherently used to indicate errors or other useful information.

In regard to claim 6, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...wherein the message comprises a line number of the source code."

The lines are sequentially numbered (column 3, lines 36 – 38; e.g., Figure 3).

In regard to claim 7, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:

"...wherein the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is located using the line number."

See column 3, lines 36 – 38; column 5, lines 25 – 33; e.g., Figure 3).

In regard to claim 8, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...wherein the message comprises a name of a file containing the source code."

E.g., see Figure 3.

In regard to claim 10:

"displaying a graphical representation of the source code;

receiving a message corresponding to a portion of the source code;

locating the portion of the source code corresponding to the message;

displaying the portion of the source code corresponding to the message; and

displaying the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner."

Claim 10 is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

In regard to claim 11, incorporating the rejection of claim 10:

"...further comprising the steps of:

detecting an error in the source code; and

generating a message reflecting the error."

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 5 above.

In regard to claim 12, incorporating the rejection of claim 10:

"...wherein the message is received from a verification tool."

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 2 above.

In regard to claim 13, incorporating the rejection of claim 12:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a compiler."

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 3 above.

In regard to claim 15, incorporating the rejection of claim 10:

"...wherein the message comprises an error message."

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 5 above.

In regard to claim 16, incorporating the rejection of claim 10:

"...wherein the message comprises a line number of the source code."

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 6 above.

In regard to claim 17, incorporating the rejection of claim 16:

"...wherein the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is located using the line number."

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 7 above.

In regard to claim 18, incorporating the rejection of claim 10:

"...wherein the message comprises a name of a file containing the source code."

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 8 above.

In regard to claim 20:

"receiving a message corresponding, to a portion of the source code; and

displaying the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner."

Claim 20 is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

In regard to claim 21, incorporating the rejection of claim 20:

"... wherein the message is received from a verification tool."

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 2.

In regard to claim 22, incorporating the rejection of claim 21:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a compiler."

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 24, incorporating the rejection of claim 20:

"...wherein the message comprises an error message."

Claim 24 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 5.

In regard to claim 25, incorporating the rejection of claim 20:

"...wherein the message comprises a line number of the source code."

Claim 25 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 6.

In regard to claim 26, incorporating the rejection of claim 25:

"...wherein the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is located using the line number."

Claim 26 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 7.

In regard to claim 27, incorporating the rejection of claim 20:

"...wherein the message comprises a name of a file containing the source code."

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 8.

In regard to claims 29 – 166:

These claims dealing with error messages to the developer are rejected in view of Applicants' admission of prior art on page 29 of the specification stating: "If the QA module determines that the source code does not conform to the audit and/or the metrics requirements, an error message is provided to the developer. The audit and metrics requirements are well known in software development."

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 167:

"displaying a graphical representation of the source code;

locating a portion of the source code corresponding to the message;

displaying the portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner;

determining whether the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is displayed; and

when it is determined that the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is not displayed, displaying the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message; and"

modifying the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner."

The above limitations are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

"detecting an error in the source code;

generating a message reflecting the error;"

It is well known in the art that a debugger and compilers, as disclosed in Pazel, inherently detects errors and displays a message reflecting the error.

In regard to claim 168, incorporating the rejection of claim 167:

"...wherein the message is generated by a verification tool."

Claim 168 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 2.

In regard to claim 169, incorporating the rejection of claim 168:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a compiler."

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 169 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 3.

In regard to claim 171, incorporating the rejection of claim 167:

"...wherein the message comprises an error message."

Claim 171 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 5.

In regard to claim 172, incorporating the rejection of claim 167:

"....wherein the message comprises a line number of the source code."

Claim 172 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 6.

In regard to claim 173, incorporating the rejection of claim 172:

"...wherein the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is located using the line number."

Claim 173 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 7.

In regard to claim 174, incorporating the rejection of claim 167:

"...wherein the message comprises a name of a file containing the source code."

Claim 174 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 8.

In regard to claim 176:

"displaying a graphical representation of the source code;

locating a portion of the source coda corresponding to the message;

displaying the portion of the source code corresponding to the message; and

Art Unit: 2124

displaying the graphical representation of the portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner."

The above limitations are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

"detecting an error in the source code;

generating a message reflecting the error;"

It is well known in the art that a debugger and compilers, as disclosed in Pazel, inherently detects errors and displays a message reflecting the error.

In regard to claim 177, incorporating the rejection of claim 176:

"...wherein the message is generated by a verification tool."

Claim 177 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 2.

In regard to claim 178, incorporating the rejection of claim 177:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a compiler."

Claim 178 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 3.

In regard to claim 180, incorporating the rejection of claim 176:

"...wherein the message comprises an error message."

Claim 180 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 5.

In regard to claim 181, incorporating the rejection of claim 176:

"...wherein the message comprises a line number of the source code."

Claim 181 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 182, incorporating the rejection of claim 181:

"...wherein the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is located using the line number."

Claim 182 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 7.

In regard to claim 183, incorporating the rejection of claim 176:

"...wherein the message comprises a name of a file containing the source code."

Claim 183 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 8.

In regard to claim 185:

"detecting an error in the source code;

generating a message reflecting the error; and"

It is well known in the art that a debugger and compilers, as disclosed in Pazel, inherently detects errors and displays a message reflecting the error.

"displaying the graphical representation of a portion of the source code corresponding to the message in a visually distinctive manner."

Rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 1 above.

In regard to claim 186, incorporating the rejection of claim 185:

"... wherein the message is generated by a verification tool."

Claim 186 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 2.

In regard to claim 187, incorporating the rejection of claim 186:

"... wherein the verification tool comprises a compiler."

Claim 187 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Art Unit: 2124

In regard to claim 189, incorporating the rejection of claim 185:

“... wherein the message comprises an error message.”

Claim 189 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 5.

In regard to claim 190, incorporating the rejection of claim 185:

“... wherein the message comprises a line number of the source code.”

Claim 190 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 6.

In regard to claim 191, incorporating the rejection of claim 190:

“... wherein the portion of the source code corresponding to the message is located using the line number.”

Claim 191 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 7.

In regard to claim 192, incorporating the rejection of claim 185:

“... wherein the message comprises a name of a file containing the source code.”

Claim 192 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 8.

Claims 194 – 196, 198 – 201 (computer readable medium) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8 (corresponding methods).

Claims 203 – 206, 208 – 211 (computer readable medium) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 10 – 13, 15 – 18 (corresponding methods).

Art Unit: 2124

Claims 213 – 215, 217 – 220 (computer readable medium) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 20 – 22, 24 – 27 (corresponding methods).

Claims 222 – 224, 226 – 229 (computer readable medium) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 167 – 169, 171 – 174 (corresponding methods).

Claims 231 – 233, 235 – 238 (computer readable medium) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 176 – 178, 180 – 183 (corresponding methods).

Claims 240 – 242, 244 – 247 (computer readable medium) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 185 – 187, 189 – 192 (corresponding methods).

Claims 249 – 252, 254 – 257 (data processing system) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 10 – 13, 15 – 18 (corresponding methods).

Claims 259 – 261, 263 – 266 (data processing system) are rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 8 (corresponding methods).

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 268 (system) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 20 (corresponding method).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4, 14, 23, 170, 179, 188, 197, 207, 216, 225, 234, 243, 253, and 262 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pazel, U.S. Patent 5,410,648 (Reissue 36,422) in view of Hicken, et al., U.S. Patent 6,473,896 (hereinafter referred to as Hicken).

In regard to claim 4, incorporating the rejection of claim 2:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a quality assurance module."

Pazel does not explicitly disclose a quality assurance module, however Hicken discloses a quality analyzer used by the compiler (e.g., Figure 1) in conjunction with a debugger (column 5, lines 12 – 47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Pazel invention with the quality analyzer of Hicken because it is desirable and well known in the art to optimize code in order to produce efficient code.

In regard to claim 14, incorporating the rejection of claim 12:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a quality assurance module."

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 4 above.

In regard to claim 23, incorporating the rejection of claim 21:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a quality assurance module."

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 4.

In regard to claim 170, incorporating the rejection of claim 168:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a quality assurance module."

Claim 170 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 4.

In regard to claim 179, incorporating the rejection of claim 177:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a quality assurance module."

Claim 179 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 4.

In regard to claim 188, incorporating the rejection of claim 186:

"...wherein the verification tool comprises a quality assurance module."

Claim 188 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 4.

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 197 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 4 (corresponding method).

Claim 207 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 14 (corresponding method).

Claim 216 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 23 (corresponding method).

Claim 225 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 170 (corresponding method).

Claim 234 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 179 (corresponding method).

Claim 243 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 188 (corresponding method).

Claim 253 (data processing system) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 14 (corresponding method).

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 262 (data processing system) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 4 (corresponding method).

8. Claims 9, 19, 28, 175, 184, 193, 202, 212, 221, 230, 239, 248, 258, and 267 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pazel, U.S. Patent 5,410,648 (Reissue 36,422) in view of Graham, U.S. Patent 5,918,053.

In regard to claim 9, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...wherein the graphical representation comprises a class diagram."

Pazel discloses a flow graph, but does not disclose a class diagram. However, Graham discloses class diagrams derived from underlying code (e.g., Figures 15 – 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the flow graph capability in the Pazel invention with the well known diagramming of classes as taught by Graham, because the combination logically follows if one is debugging an object-oriented application with the display capability of program flow in Pazel.

In regard to claim 19, incorporating the rejection of claim 10:

"...wherein the graphical representation comprises a class diagram."

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 9.

In regard to claim 28, incorporating the rejection of claim 20:

"...wherein the graphical representation comprises a class diagram."

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 28 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 9.

In regard to claim 175, incorporating the rejection of claim 167:

"... wherein the graphical representation comprises a class diagram."

Claim 172 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 9.

In regard to claim 184, incorporating the rejection of claim 176:

"...wherein the graphical representation comprises a class diagram."

Claim 178 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 9.

In regard to claim 193, incorporating the rejection of claim 185:

"...wherein the graphical representation comprises a class diagram."

Claim 193 is rejected for the same reason put forth in the rejection of claim 9.

Claim 202 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 9 (corresponding method).

Claim 212 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 19 (corresponding method).

Claim 221 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 28 (corresponding method).

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 230 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 175 (corresponding method).

Claim 239 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 184 (corresponding method).

Claim 248 (computer readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 193 (corresponding method).

Claim 258 (data processing system) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 19 (corresponding method).

Claim 267 (data processing system) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 9 (corresponding method).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Shrader whose telephone number is (703) 305-8046.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:00-16:30.

Art Unit: 2124

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

3 June 2004


ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER